



Image

2823

Attorney Docket No. 0756-2330

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:	)	Group Art Unit: 2823
Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.	)	Examiner: B. Kebede
Serial No. 09/894,125	)	<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</u>
Filed: June 29, 2001	)	I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
For: CRYSTALLINE SEMICONDUCTOR	)	deposited with the United States Postal Service
THIN FILM, METHOD OF	)	with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an
FABRICATING THE SAME,	)	envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE, AND	)	P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on
METHOD OF FABRICATING THE	)	<u>3.31.2004</u>
SAME	)	<u>Adile M. Stamps</u>

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the interview granted on March 17, 2004. Further to the Amendment filed February 17, 2004, the Applicants submit the present *Supplemental Response*.

In the interview, the Applicants' representative brought to the Examiner's attention the partial consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed June 29, 2001. The Examiner confirmed that he has access to JP '329, the English language abstract for JP '329, and the fourteen U.S. references which were cited in the above-referenced IDS but which were not yet considered. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 evidencing consideration of these Information Disclosure Statements.

A further Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

With respect to the obviousness rejection based on U.S. Patent No. 6,077,731 to Yamazaki et al. and JP 09-186336 to Kudo et al., the Examiner agreed that Yamazaki '731 is prior art under § 102(e), which is noted in the *Interview Summary*. The Applicants respectfully submit that Yamazaki '731, as a commonly owned reference under § 102(e), may not be considered for a rejection under § 103. Subject matter developed by another which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) and (g) is not to be considered when determining whether an invention sought to be patented is obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, provided the subject matter and the claimed invention were commonly owned at the time the invention was made. See MPEP § 2146. Since the disclosure by Yamazaki '731 and the claimed invention of the present application were, at the time the invention was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to Semiconductor Energy Laboratory Co., Ltd., Yamazaki '731 may not be considered for a rejection under § 103. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

In any event, the Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Yamazaki '731 appears to teach or suggest that a hydrogen plasma treatment step is equivalent to the leveling step of the present invention, or that the hydrogen plasma treatment should occur after removing an oxide film or after treating a surface of a semiconductor film with a hydrofluoric acid.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
PMB 955  
21010 Southbank Street  
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165  
(571) 434-6789